

# RASTER CHART DISPLAY SYS FIELD TEST

#### **IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION**

Name of Vessel Type, Tons, Lengt	Mony tonkers, passanger ships, and but carried
Company Name	Southwest Alaska Pilots Assoc.
Contact Name	
Address	
Telephone	
E-Mail	

#### RASTER CHART EQUIPMENT IN USE DURING TEST

Navigation Software	Nautrec 97
Version	lateit
Manufacturer	Noheltec
Computer	Toshiba laptop
Monitor Size	12.
Monitor Resolution	
Raster Data Brand	NOAA/ BSR Chacti

## OTHER EQUIPMENT IN USE DURING TEST

Indicate (Y/N) as to whether the equipment is integrated with the raster chart navigation software. Then indicate the manufacturer and model.

GPS (Y)N)	GORMIN CRS	- 45		
DGPS (Y/N)				 
Radar (Y/N)				 
ARPA (Y/N)				 
LORAN C (Y/N)				 
Speed Log (Y/N)				 
Compass (Y/N)				 
Other (Y/N)			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	 

perator's Name			
perator's Rank	Piot		
CDS Experience	3		•
ears Experience as			
. ■ hel	msman		
nav	igation/chart work		
■ off	icer of the watch		
■ Ca	ptain/Master of a vesse	1	
pile	•	24	
<u> </u>			
<b>=</b> ou	ner (specify)		
EST AREA			
<u></u>		•	
escribe the main rou	utes or general geograp	hic area where the RCDS	was being used and
alueted:			
C-K-T-	+ Prima lell	illiam Sound, Kad	at I Achinh
TO INTE	I TIME OUT	THORE COURTY TOLL	
Haska			
Haska			
AVICATION FOR	VIDONMENT		
ANGGATION EN	VIRONMENT		
		ence being reflected in this	test report, the
stimate as a percent	age of the total experie	ince being reflected in this	test report, the
stimate as a percent	age of the total experie	ence being reflected in this a the following situations.	test report, the
stimate as a percent mount of time the R	age of the total experie	n the following situations.	test report, the
stimate as a percent mount of time the R pen Water Passage	age of the total experie	n the following situations.  Heavy Traffic	
stimate as a percent mount of time the R pen Water Passage oastal Transit	age of the total experie	n the following situations.  Heavy Traffic  Medium Traffic	50_
stimate as a percent mount of time the R pen Water Passage oastal Transit arbor & Approach	age of the total experie	n the following situations.  Heavy Traffic	
stimate as a percent mount of time the R pen Water Passage loastal Transit larbor & Approach channels/Constricted	age of the total experie	n the following situations.  Heavy Traffic  Medium Traffic	50_
mount of time the Ropen Water Passage Coastal Transit Harbor & Approach Channels/Constricted Oocking	age of the total experie	n the following situations.  Heavy Traffic  Medium Traffic  Light or No Traffic	50 total 100%
stimate as a percent mount of time the R open Water Passage loastal Transit larbor & Approach channels/Constricted	age of the total experie	the following situations.  Heavy Traffic  Medium Traffic  Light or No Traffic  Day Navigation	50 total 100%
stimate as a percent mount of time the R pen Water Passage oastal Transit (arbor & Approach channels/Constricted	age of the total experie	n the following situations.  Heavy Traffic  Medium Traffic  Light or No Traffic	50 total 100%
stimate as a percent mount of time the R open Water Passage loastal Transit larbor & Approach Channels/Constricted locking other (specify)	tage of the total experience. CDS was being used in total 100%	the following situations.  Heavy Traffic  Medium Traffic  Light or No Traffic  Day Navigation	50 total 100%
stimate as a percent mount of time the R open Water Passage loastal Transit larbor & Approach channels/Constricted locking other (specify)	total 100%	Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation Night Navigation	50   50   total 100%   50   total 100%
stimate as a percent mount of time the R pen Water Passage oastal Transit (arbor & Approach channels/Constricted ocking other (specify)	tage of the total experience. CDS was being used in total 100%	Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation Night Navigation Quiet Seas	50 total 100% 50 50 total 100%
stimate as a percent nount of time the R pen Water Passage oastal Transit arbor & Approach hannels/Constricted ocking ther (specify) xcellent Visibility air Visibility	total 100%  25  40  25	Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation Night Navigation Quiet Seas Light Seas	50 total 100% 50 50 total 100%
stimate as a percent mount of time the R pen Water Passage oastal Transit (arbor & Approach channels/Constricted ocking other (specify)	total 100%	Heavy Traffic Medium Traffic Light or No Traffic Day Navigation Night Navigation Quiet Seas	50 total 100% 50 50 total 100%

Over How Long a Period?

(example answer: Approx. 8 months over 1 year with the rest being in-port periods.)

Being Summarized in This Test Report:

EVALUATION SCALE (use for all questions)

		DESCRIPTORS			
		& SCORE			
does not apply	much worse than paper chart	somewhat worse	comparable to paper chart	somewhat better	superior to paper chart
0	1	2	3	4	5
cannot comments	significant problem	minor problem	no problem	minor advantage	significant advantage
0	1	2	3	4	5
did not observe	hard to use	moderately difficult use	ndequate ease of use	moderately easy to use	easy to use
0	1	2	3	4	5
did not use	inadequate	marginal	acceptable	good	excellent
0	1	ž	3	4	5

EVALUATION SCALE (use for all questions)

### 1. RCDS AS A VOYAGE PLANNING TOOL

If using an RCDS for voyage planning is about the same as using a paper chart, then score the item in the middle of the range at "3".

Ref	Scores	Questions
#	(1-5 or 0)	(compared to paper chart performance where appropriate)
		How would you evaluate doing the following navigation functions with a raster chart compared to doing the comparable functions on a paper chart?
1.1	3	- entering routes, the adequacy of the number that could be entered?
1.2	3	- entering waypoints and if an adequate number were allowed?
1.3	3	- adding waypoints to a route after entering or reloading it?
1.4	3	- deleting waypoints from a route?
1.5	2	- changing the position of a waypoint?
1.6	2	- changing the order of waypoints in a route?
1.7	2	- entering an adequate number of alternative routes?
1.8	2	- distinguishing alternate routes from the principal one?
1.9	3	- displaying routes over other charts?
1.10	3	- reloading previously planned routes for further planning?
1.11	2	- dropping or inserting waypoints in real-time as you went?
1.12		- loading load tracks actually sailed for use in planning?
1.13	3	- specifying a cross-track error to trigger an automatic alarm?
1.14	1	- entering and annotating marks (operator-entered points)?
1.15	2	- editing and/or deleting marks?
1.16	2	- entering points, lines or areas which would activate an alarm such
	3	as guard zones, boundaries, range circles, etc.?
1.17	1	- entering notes that you wanted to enter?
1.18		- preparing a printed a voyage plan, a get home chartlet, GPS waypoints?

		Remember, you are to evaluate doing the following navigation
		functions using a raster chart compared to doing the comparable
		functions on a paper chart.
1.19	A	- calculate the distance of your planned trip?
1.20	A	- calculate bearing and distance to waypoints?
1.21	3	- estimate transit time(s)?
1.22	4	- recalculate time along track if you moved waypoints?
1.23	4 5	- readily display all the charts you needed?
1.24	5	- move around the chart (pan and zoom) while planning?
1.25		- display previously entered data over any chart you wanted?
1.26	5	- make the planning assessments and judgements that you would make
	,D	with a paper chart?
1.27		How was the planning workload compared to a paper chart?
		Score the following questions without comparing to a paper chart.
1.28	3	How was the legibility of the chart image during your planning session?
1.29		How was the impact on planning of seeing only a portion of a chart on the
	2	screen at one time?
1.30	2	How was the impact of chart notes not always being visible?
1.31	2	How was the impact of some charts being on different map projections?
1.32	P	How would you compare planning using a raster chart system with
İ	-	planning using manual means and a paper chart?
1.33		Were there any fundamental limitations to planning using raster charts
1		that were not just a limit of your software? What were they?
		Yes, overcoming mony years of exposurce
		Wes, overcoming many years of expensional
		CON hold, write on, etc.
	l	

### 2. RCDS FOR VOYAGE MONITORING

If using an RCDS for voyage monitoring is about the same as a paper chart, then score the item in the middle of the range at "3".

Ref #	Scores (1-5 or 0)	Questions (compared to paper chart performance where appropriate)
		How would you evaluate doing the following navigation functions using a raster chart compared to doing the comparable functions on a paper chart?
2.1	5	- displaying clearly all chart and voyage monitoring information?
2.2	2	- add or remove mariner-added information?
2.3	2	- display, hide or query mariner-added information?

T		Remember, you are to evaluate doing the following navigation
		functions using a raster chart compared to doing the comparable
		functions on a paper chart.
2.4	3	- determine if a larger scale chart covers the area you are navigating?
2.5		- distinguish the ship's track and mariner's notes on the image?
2.6	- 2	- showing your position accurately on the chart in real-time?
2.7	3 5 3	- performing dead reckoning if your positioning system failed?
2.8	4	- displaying a planned route?
2.9	4	- displaying an alternate route in addition to the selected one?
2.10	4	- distinguishing the alternative route from the selected one?
2.11	4	- modifying the selected route?
2.12	4	- find and display any chart easily during voyage monitoring?
2.13	4	- move around the chart (pan and zoom) to monitor your voyage?
2.14	2	- look-ahead on the route during route monitoring?
2.15	<b>3</b>	- achieve an adequate overview of the voyage and route?
2.16	78	- transfer information you entered other charts?
2.17	3	- view chart notes which were located off-screen?
2.18	5	- create event marks at any time and annotate them?
2.19	4	- estimating of arrival time compared to a paper chart?
2.20	5	- display the coordinates of any point on demand?
2.21	3	- enter coordinates and then display that position on demand?
2.22		- determine your lat./long. at any time?
2.23	5	- dynamically measure range and bearing to charted objects?
2.24		- monitor voyage parameters (speed over ground, course over
2.24	5	ground, speed made good, time to go,)?
2.25	5	- switch from chart to chart manually in a convenient manner?
2.23	3	
		Score the following questions without comparing to a paper chart.
2.26	7	The adequacy of the screen size?
2.27		Screen "clutter" compared to a paper chart during voyage monitoring?
2.28	2	The night colors for comfortable and legible viewing?
2.29		Did the ship and route automatically appear whenever the display
2.27	4	covered that area?
2.30	<del>                                     </del>	Did the chart automatically pan as the ship reached an appropriate
2.50	4	distance from the edge of the screen?
2.31	A	View an area of the chart that did not contain the ship and have route
1.51		monitoring/positioning continue in the background?
2.32	4	By a single action, show chart scale, datum, and depth and height units?
2.33		Determine range and bearing to items that were off-screen?
2.34		Restore the ship-centered display with a single action?
2.35		Did waypoint arrival alarms work as you wished?
2.36	1 3	Did boundary crossing alarms work as you wished?
2.37		Were there frequent false alarms?
2.38		Did an alarm sound when you exceeded the cross track error limit?

т	т	Remember, you are scoring the following questions without
		comparison to a paper chart.
2.20		Did an alarm sound if the ship, within a mariner-specified time or
2.39	5	distance, was to reach a critical point on the planned route?
		distance, was to reach a critical point on the plainted route.
2.40	5	Did your system give an indication if positioning system input was lost?
2.41	$\alpha$	If 2 positioning systems were used simultaneously, did the system
	9	identify discrepancies between the two?
2.42	9	Was route monitoring carried out in a simple and reliable manner?
2.43	5	In restricted waterways, how was the RCDS as a voyage monitoring tool
	כ	compared to the paper chart?
2.44	~	In congested waterway situations, how was the RCDS as a voyage
	5	monitoring tool compared to the paper chart?
2.45		Could time-labels along the ships track be displayed easily at a range of
1 2	5	intervals between 1 and 120 minutes?
2.46	5	Were you always able to navigate north up?
2.47		If course-up navigation was offered, how was it compared to using a
2.7/	O	paper chart?
2.48		How would you compare voyage monitoring using a raster chart system
2.40	5	with voyage monitoring using a paper chart?
2.40	l .	How was the voyage monitoring workload compared to a paper chart?
2.49	5	How was the voyage monitoring workload compared to a paper chart.
2.50	5	How would you rate using RCDS as the primary means of navigation
	ļ	compared to paper charts?
2.51	5	How would you evaluate the impact on the safety of navigation when
		using an RCDS as opposed to a paper chart?
2.52		Are there circumstances where you would not use RCDS for voyage
1	Ì	monitoring? When? IF CRS Signal was questionable or during
	3	IF CRS SIGNED COM GARAGE
	)	times of scheduld GBs cutoges.
1		Time. 8) Codoada
2.53		Were there any fundamental limitations to voyage monitoring with
1		raster charts that were not just a limit of your software? What were
		they?
ŀ		
1		
- 1	1	

# 3. RCDS FOR VOYAGE RECORDING

Ref	Scores	Questions
#	(1-5 or 0)	(compared to paper chart performance where appropriate)
3.1	5	Could you record sufficient information to determine the ship's past track, time, position, heading and speed?
3.2	15	Were you able to add log entries manually?
3.3	. 0	Could you automatically record the official data used (RNC, edition, date and update history)?
3.4	5	Were you able to gather an adequate record of the voyage compared to using a paper chart?
3.5	5	Could you record the entire course made good with time marks at intervals not exceeding 4 hours?
3.6	5	Were you able to save at least the previous 12 hours of voyage track?

#### 4. OTHER

Ref	Scores	Questions
#	(1-5 or 0)	(compared to paper chart performance where appropriate)
4.1		Were the accuracy of all calculations independent of the characteristics
	$\bigcirc$	of the display and consistent with the RNC accuracy?
4.2	5	Were bearings and distances measured on the display as accurate as that
	<b>-</b>	afforded by the resolution of the display?
4.3		Could you make manual updates to the chart that were distinguishable
	1	from the original chart without affecting the legibility of the chart?
4.4	N/A	Did the RCDS degrade the performance of any equipment that was
	107 54	connected to it?
4.5	2	Once learned, how user-friendly would you judge the RCDS to be?
4.6	ن	Did connection to other equipment degrade RCDS performance?
4.7	3	Did your system give adequate indication of system malfunction?
4.8		Were you able to execute in a convenient and timely manner all route
	4	planning, route monitoring and positioning performed on a paper chart?
4.9		How much would you say the RCDS reduced the navigational
	5	workload compared to using a paper chart?
4.10		Summary Evaluation: Considering all of your experience and the
1		questions asked above, how would you score the following statement?
	,	
	5	"RCDS with adequate back-up arrangements used together with an
		appropriate folio of up-to-date paper charts may be accepted as
		complying with the chart carriage requirements of SOLAS."

Make any other comments you feel are relevant to the use of RCDS as the primary means of navigation on the back of this page.